

**Ravalli County Planning Board
Meeting Minutes for October 18, 2006
7:00 p.m.
Commissioners Meeting Room, 215 S. 4th Street, Hamilton, Montana**

Public Hearing

Resolution to Adopt Old Corvallis Road Area 3 Neighborhood Plan as an Amendment to the
Growth Policy

Plat Evaluations

One Horse Estates (Martin) Major Subdivision and Two Variance Requests
Moiese Meadows (Lords) Major Subdivision

*This is a summary of the meeting, not a verbatim transcript. A CD of the meeting
may be purchased from the Planning Department for \$5.00.*

1. Call to order

Dan called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call (See Attachment A, Roll Call Sheet)

(A) Members

Mary Lee Bailey (present)
Dale Brown (present)
Phil Connelly (present)
Ben Hillicoss (absent – excused)
Dan Huls (present)
Maura Murray (present)
Tori Nobles (absent – excused)
Chip Pigman (absent – excused)
Tom Ruffatto (present)
Les Rutledge (present)
Lori Schallenberger (present)

Park Board Representative: Bob Cron (present)

(B) Staff

Afton Clack
Jennifer De Groot
Karen Hughes
John Lavey
Shaun Morrell
Tristan Riddell
George Corn

3. **Approval of Minutes**

Dan asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes from October 4, 2006. There were none. The minutes were approved.

4. **Amendments to the Agenda**

There were none.

5. **Correspondence**

There was none.

6. **Disclosure of Possible/Perceived Conflicts**

There were none.

7. **Plat Evaluation**

(A) **One Horse Estates (Martin) Major Subdivision and Two Variance Requests**

(i) Presentation by Terry Nelson, Applebury Survey

Terry Nelson said that this subdivision proposal is for 79 lots off US Highway 93 south of Florence. All lots will be accessed by the three existing approaches. As for effects on agriculture, the land was previously used for pastureland, but there is not much soil classified as Prime Farmland Soils or Farmland of Statewide Importance. He noted that the proposal is close to Florence and keeps with existing developments in the area. He also noted that there are no water rights on the property, but that there is an irrigation ditch along the west boundary which dumps into a draw that serves only Mr. Martin. He said that the subdivision will not have negative effects on local services due to its proximity to Florence. He stated that MDT has preliminarily approved the approaches and that utilities exist along US Highway 93. The developer is proposing a \$250 per lot contribution to the school district. Regarding effects on the natural environment, he noted that they did not do a wetland study, but left a no-build zone to protect wetlands in the north of the subdivision. As for effects on wildlife, he remarked that there were no species of special concern and that they wanted to have a denser development here to alleviate development farther out to help wildlife habitat. He added that the proposed subdivision will be close to Florence's emergency services. The Florence Volunteer Fire District does require a \$500 contribution and he announced that they are willing to do that or do a like/kind exchange for a water pump. He noted they are also proposing a park which will also serve as a drain field.

He reported that they are proposing two variances, the first of which is for phasing. He observed that the Regulations only allow for two phases over four years, but that they are proposing five phases over the course of ten years, due to the number of lots. He noted the other variance was to pipe the drainage area if it is not a ditch. He announced that to get road and storm water drainage approved, they would need to determine if it was a natural drainage. He added that they proposed piping to help alleviate pressure of the central drain field so that water does not seep into the ground. He said that Tom Ruffatto looked at the ditch and stated in his letter that it

was, indeed, a ditch. He remarked that the proposed amended covenants (See Attachment B, Amendment to One Horse Estates Covenants) are currently the covenants on the north part of the property and that the lower parcels do not have any covenants. He noted the covenants changed commercial restrictions and four lots have the potential for commercial sites.

(ii) Public Comment

There were none.

(iii) Board Discussion and questions

Les asked for clarification about the ditch. He stated that aerials show lots that are directly over the drainage ditch and he assumed that they were proposing to bury a pipe from the west to the east.

Terry said the developer is leaving the ditch open on Lots 14 and 15 and with a 50 foot drainage easement. Then, the drainage would be piped and within a 15 foot pipeline easement.

Les said that Lot 25 is a small lot and looks like it is right over the vegetated area. He asked if they will declare those lots buildable after the pipe is put in.

Terry replied that, yes, when the pipe goes in, there will be major construction in that area.

Les said, regarding Buckaroo Road near Beck Lane, he thought that internal roads had to be perpendicular to the external road.

Terry commented that it was unique because MDT provided that access while they were aware of the subdivision.

Les stated that it seemed that if it is in violation of a subdivision regulation they should request a variance noted there was nothing from the Ravalli County Road and Bridge Department in that regard.

Mary Lee observed that the first phase will have its own well and water and was curious as to what they anticipated for wells.

Terry reported that the first phase will be one to one and a half acre lots and that they will have individual wells and septic on each lot.

Mary Lee asked if they had drilled for water.

Terry said they had contacted Howard Neuman. When Mountain Meadows was done, he did a hydrology study on that subdivision and did not see issues with water in that area. He added that there is an aquifer underneath and they have preliminary approval from Ravalli County Environmental Health Department. He also added that DEQ did not say whether they had any issues yet or not.

Mary Lee asked about the next phase.

Terry reported that the next phase will have individual wells and a collective sewer system which will be in the park area.

Les asked if they will have an above ground system or underground septic.

Terry replied that Ron is doing the engineering and that there will be an underground sewer system. He added that there will be a bit of a mound on the west side similar to Wildflower, but that it will be a nice park area. The drain field will be in the west side.

Bob asked what happens after water is piped to the highway.

Terry stated that it goes through the ditch to the highway, and then it goes north. The pipe easement stops at the northeast corner of the park.

Bob added that bad things happen when the pipe does not carry the water and he asked for an oversized pipe.

Terry remarked that Ron has already proposed that and WGM has reviewed it.

Bob also added that he likes the park and the fact that it will have accesses from all three sides of the subdivision, but was wondering if there would be trails, sidewalks, or some way for people to access the highway trail.

Terry replied there would not be. He said that they proposed paths and walking paths into the park, but that the Highway Department put in a huge storm water drain and a large fence.

Bob announced that he wants people to be able to get to the highway trail without biking on the streets and asked them to consider that. He also wondered if the Homeowner's Association will own the park.

Terry said they will because the homeowners will have to maintain it.

Bob noted that the Park Board has negotiated with another subdivision so that a park will be donated to Ravalli County.

Les added that Mountain Meadows dedicated a pathway from within the subdivision to the trail along the highway. They put up a post so no one could drive through it and he thought that might be one way to get an access to the trail.

Terry replied by saying it is not possible due to the storm water drainage ditch that is fenced off.

Tom asked why they are not burying the ditch in lots 14 & 15. He said that whoever buys them will have a culvert. He asked if they considered an alternate drainage area when the ground is frozen.

Ron Uemura declared that they had to design a system for a 100-year storm which needed a 12-inch pipe. To be safe, he doubled the size. He said they also graded the ground around it so the houses are up higher.

Tom said that they could cross Lots 14 and 15 with a pipe. He then asked if they would be fenced for children and if there were any openings for maintenance.

Ron said there would be openings and that they could extend it further.

Tom asked how much water the property has out of Sweeney Creek.

Dick Martin replied it is 125 inches. He said that it might affect basements if there was too much water.

Tom then asked how many cubic feet per second will the pipe carry.

Ron remarked that a 100-year storm pipe can carry five cfs or less and that a 24-inch pipe can carry 15 to 20 cfs. He said he does not want to impact anyone, especially with nice homes.

Tom then asked if they can diffuse the energy that comes down the pipe.

Ron replied it is a flat slope, but they will diffuse it.

Karen reported that road regulations changed the intersections provision. She said that subsection was changed from old regulations to AASHTO standards and that new intersection requirements do not require alignment.

Ron noted that part of Beck Lane is perpendicular to US Highway 93.

Tom wondered if they have talked about bus stops along the highway and if they could talk to the school about their preferences.

Dan said that there were lots of severe soils.

Terry added that due to high groundwater, Dick Martin was hoping to do one acre or bigger lots and would be forced to have a centralized drain field. He said he will propose restrictions/warnings that if they do have a basement, there is a potential of high groundwater. He also said there will be notification of severe soils and maps showing where they are located.

8. Public Hearing

(A) Resolution to Adopt Old Corvallis Road Area 3 Neighborhood Plan as an Amendment to the Growth Policy

(i) Staff Report

John Horwich gave a PowerPoint Presentation and noted that there was a new legal notice because the first notice's legality was questioned. He discussed what a neighborhood plan was and noted it is not regulatory or a subdivision proposal. He gave specific examples of the public process the plan went through. He said the land is in the County but the plan contemplates annexation into the city in the future. The proposed plan consists of 487 acres and 32 separate parcels, but the Stock Farm and the Bessenyeys own roughly 75% of the land and the boundary was established based on city sewer areas. He said a sewer main was put down Old

Corvallis Road to serve GlaxoSmithKline and sewer service Areas 1 through 3. He also said there needs to be lift stations for the sewer and that the area boundaries were drawn by engineers for future sewer areas. He stated that the land was prime for development because it is close to the city of Hamilton. He added that the plan needs to be consistent with the Ravalli County Growth Policy and the Hamilton City Growth Policy.

He then listed some of the community character goals the plan addresses. He commented that growth should be next to infrastructure so a fairly dense development can be accommodated. He said they want future development to retain the integrity of the Daly Mansion and that there is currently no protection of the tree-lined street or view from the mansion. He said that plan keeps open space to the east of Old Corvallis Road and the neighborhood will be a cohesive, coordinated community with a consistent road system. He stated that public open space should be planned based on the entire neighborhood. He added that economically, business development makes good sense and that there should be a business corridor along Old Corvallis Road. He noted that the Ravalli County Economic Development Authority has plans for a development in the proposed commercial area. He said it should generate a good business climate for research and development and new knowledge-based businesses. He continued that they would like to facilitate a high-class industrial or business park with some professional offices for serving both businesses and residents, but that would not compete with downtown Hamilton. He proposed that it can have a campus-like atmosphere, including significant landscaped areas. He said lot sizes range from three to twenty acres in the planned commercial area, but the plan encourages combination of lots instead of having multiple accesses for aesthetic reasons. He envisioned a mass-transit system to tie in with vanpools or bus services to and from Missoula. He also reported that the plan proposes discouraging through traffic on Old Corvallis Road so that people mainly use US Highway 93 or Eastside Highway.

He stated that there would be an average housing density of 2.9 net units per acre. He said the plan provides densities of up to 10 dwelling units per acre using a transfer of development rights program, but that in no instance would residential intensity exceed more than 840 dwelling units in Area 3. He added that the plan calls for a variety of housing types. The plan encourages cluster development to preserve public and private open space. He proposed a non-motorized trail system with connections to the parks, the Daly Mansion, adjoining neighborhoods, business areas, schools, and the Fairgrounds which should be separate from the road system. He continued that they could implement a zoning and land use plan to require trails and paths and that they could also look into a transit hub with paved parking. He said that the proposed plan would be implemented through the Growth Policy. He noted that from there, the County could adopt zoning and the City and County can amend their subdivision regulations (See Attachment C).

Phil asked John where he came up with the density.

John said it came from the sewer capacity identified for the property from City engineers.

Phil commented that trail systems could eat into the land and would drive up density.

John said that trails and roads were included. He noted that the plan was more dense before he received the engineering report and noted that the Arbors has a density of 4.7 units per acre.

Dan asked what the dedicated road width of Old Corvallis Road was.

John stated that there was controversy over the road and that it had not been resolved.

Dan said there will be some traffic flow that will funnel there, but that leaves the US Highway 93 access and Fairgrounds Road.

John said there are potentials for other right-of-ways.

Karen said that planning for an area should drive infrastructure and other amenities plans.

John said there have been discussions about which comes first, infrastructure or planning.

Lori said she did not feel that the City was willing to cooperate with city water and sewer. She did not like the idea of individual septic systems and wells.

John replied that the City has shot down the plan and that this plan will guarantee the land does not develop with septic systems and wells. He noted the area could have a package sewer and a public water supply provided by a developer, although it is not the preferred plan.

Karen explained that the Board could adopt a revision to the plan so that if the City does not adopt it, it will still work for the County by allowing a package sewer and water supply.

John added that with the city's reluctance, if the County does not adopt and zone the plan, someone can come in with a proposal for individual wells and septic systems. He noted that the systems will not be community septic systems, but would be more like a private sewage treatment plant and have common wells.

Les stated that if there is no countywide zoning soon, this area could be developed and would have to come through the County subdivision process. If the BCC adopts the amendment, it would forestall that from happening and the Growth Policy would limit development.

Dan remarked that the Area 3 plan is proactive planning as opposed to the reactive planning the Board normally sees.

Maura said zoning needs to comply with the Growth Policy so the amendment would take the County a step closer to zoning.

George Corn stated that in 1993, the County Commissioners met with state officials and the airport to talk about ideas and concluded that Hamilton's expansion would probably be eastward, and it has been. He added that density south of the plan has increased. He said that there has been a lot of participation in this plan and that

there will be more public participation when zoning and implementation is adopted. He declared that the protection of the Mansion was critical.

Bob said he likes the plan. He also said that a college campus might be considered for an area near the mansion and was wondering if that would conflict with these plans.

John stated that the area right by the mansion was not a good choice for the campus, due to a lack of adequate space. He noted that the campus could fit in elsewhere on the site.

Bob wondered what would be allowed in the area that can be viewed from the mansion.

John said it would be a park site with a lake. He suggested that developers concentrate the parkland and use the cash-in-lieu of parks to acquire the land. He said the park would not be a ball-field park or a completely natural area, but that the park should have picnic grounds and play areas.

Mary Lee observed that many people come here to see the mansion and this is an opportunity to save the look and view from the mansion. She said it was a wonderful plan and asked how high they can build in the industrial park.

John remarked that he wanted to say two to three stories tall. He said the distance is far enough away so that the view would not be a problem.

(ii) Three Minute Rule Waiver Requests (if any)

There were none

(iii) Public Comment

Nathan Lucke of Landworks Consulting and Design said he thinks it is an excellent plan and recommended its adoption.

Ron Lords asked if Areas 1 and 2 have been planned yet.

John replied that they have not been and noted that this area was chosen first so that the Economic Development Authority could have lift stations and because this is the closest area to the residential section of Hamilton.

(iv) Close Public Comment

(v) Board Deliberation

(a) Board discussion and questions

Les said the Bessenyeys' desire is that the plan is adopted because it is consistent with their wishes.

John said that the plan should be amended to accommodate the potential for private water and sewer service in case it cannot be hooked up to Hamilton's water and sewer system.

(b) Board consideration of and action on recommended revisions

Les motioned approval of the plan as an amendment to the Growth Policy and recommended adoption of the plan by the Commissioners.

Tom seconded the motion.

(c) Board adoption of findings and action on the Resolution

The vote was called; the members voted (8-0) to approve the Resolution. (See Attachment D, Old Corvallis Road Area 3 Vote Sheet)

The Board took a five minute break.

9. **Close Public Hearing**

10. **Plat Evaluation**

(A) **Moiese Meadows (Lords) Major Subdivision**

(i) Presentation by Landworks Consulting and Design, LLC

Nathan Lucke said that this subdivision proposal is for 33 lots, 4 miles north of Stevensville on Eastside Highway. He stated that the land is pretty flat and was used as a hayfield, although it was not prime farmland. He added there was no zoning or covenants on the land and they are proposing one acre lots served by individual wells and septic systems. There are two accesses, one on Moiese Lane and another on Eastside Highway. He said that Moiese Lane would be improved to meet County standards and two cul-de-sacs are being proposed. He explained that they are proposing a 1.35 acre park and the rest of the amount required will be cash-in-lieu.

(ii) Public comment

There was none.

(iii) Board discussion and questions

Dan asked if there were irrigation water rights.

Nathan replied that there were none and that there never were.

Tom asked if they checked with the Supply Ditch.

Nathan said it is not included in the Supply Ditch's water rights.

Mary Lee asked if they have done any well tests.

Nathan said that they submitted a DEQ application and received comment letters from RCEHD and DEQ. No comments were received regarding the water supply, but the State had technical comments on culverts.

Dan questioned if there was high groundwater.

Nathan remarked there was not and said the Sanitarian noted groundwater monitoring was not required on the site.

Les asked if there was any well pumping data at this point.

Nathan said he is only required to look at adjacent well logs to determine sufficient water.

Tom noted that the Lee Metcalf Wildlife Refuge has water rights for ditches and wrote a letter requesting them to be piped.

Nathan reported that typically they would want to pipe a ditch, but the applicant would prefer to fence it.

Tom asked how many cubic feet per second that the Lee Metcalf Wildlife Refuge has.

Nathan said it's about two feet wide and two feet deep and that it's a small, private irrigation ditch.

Tom stated that the Refuge letter said they used equipment and fire.

Nathan added that they would provide an easement and that the park would provide a buffer to the ditch and adjacent landowners.

Bob remarked that the Park Board looked at the park proposal and felt it was too narrow, up against a ditch, and was not suited to park purposes. He suggested that the developer use Lots 32 and 33 for a good park or provide full cash-in-lieu.

Nathan commented that the developer wants to keep the current proposal, which is in line with the regulations.

Dan asked how the triangle was separated from the parcel.

Nathan thinks there was some type of exemption, but it was not done recently. He said the developer is proposing \$500 per lot to the Fire District and \$250 to the Stevensville School District. He said that although MDT preliminarily said they will give access, he wondered if MDT will decline the permit. He asked if the proposal changes to have only one access and an emergency access on Eastside Highway, if it would be acceptable or change everything.

Dan declared that it would be undesirable and would cause concern.

Nathan said they could have a breakaway gate or blockade.

Maura asked how far the access was from the corner.

Nathan said it was about a quarter mile.

Dale said that schools are looking at impact fees and that the Corvallis and Florence schools are overcrowded. He added that if lots are going to be cheap the donation is acceptable, but if they are going to be more expensive lots, the developer could be more generous.

Ron Lords explained that his plan is to offer affordable housing for \$175,000 per lot or less.

Nathan stated that the Stevensville School District opened their doors to out-of-district students because they want more students. (See Attachment E, Moiese Meadows Homeowner's Association Articles of Incorporation)

11. **Communications from Staff**

(A) Public Forum for October 24 has been postponed

Karen noted that the public meeting on interim zoning had to be postponed for advertising reasons. She asked if the Board would prefer to have the forum before or after the election. She observed that the item could also be added to any Planning Board agenda.

Lori remarked that they should wait until the vote.

Tom agreed.

The Planning Board agreed to hold a meeting after the election, and asked to discuss it at the next meeting.

(B) Update on Subdivision Regulation Revisions

Karen said that the safest approach for the County is that all subdivisions not deemed sufficient as of October 1st will be put on hold until the new regulations are adopted, unless they sign an indemnification waiver. Any new subdivision or pre-application submittal are asked to sign a form acknowledging applications are on hold until the new regulations are adopted. The final draft of the regulations will need to be complete by October 25th for a November 9th hearing. She explained that the Board of County Commissioners want to hold a joint public hearing with the Planning Board to streamline the process. She noted that she provided the Board with a preliminary draft of the Subdivision Regulations. She gave a brief overview of the changes, noting that the focus of the revisions are on Chapters 1 through 4. The most extensive changes were to Chapters 3 and 4. She noted that the Model Regulations recommend removing fees from the Regulations. She explained that some chapters will not be changed at all, but Staff is recommending removal of Chapters 9 and 10, as well as materials in the appendices. She said that the County needs to then adopt Administrative Materials as separate documents. She also noted that under State Law, counties have different options for Board involvement. She recommended that the County move to one public hearing before the County Commissioners due in part to the Aspen Springs process. She noted that under the new regulations, the Planning Board can choose how they want to provide input, which gives them more time to work on planning and zoning. She noted

that it could be better use of the Board to move forward with planning instead of only doing subdivision review.

Lori asked what happened with the letter that the Board sent to James asking how subdivisions will be affected if the interim zoning resolution passes.

George Corn said that he does not know where it is at. He said he had a big meeting Tuesday with the County Commissioners and departments dealing with the election year. He said there were many ballot issues and the opinion is in process. He also said that he may be able to form an opinion, but he might not want to answer until it passes, noting that there is quite a bit of research he needs to do. He noted that David Ohnstad thought the County Attorney's Office should research all of the county roads.

12. **Communications from Public**

There were none.

13. **Communications from the Board**

Les said that he sat thru the County Commissioners' Aspen Springs Meeting and was not impressed with their procedures. He stated that they spent a lot of time on the same things that the Planning Board did and that the Board was only mentioned four times during the entire meeting. He said he disagreed with the Commissioners' decision that the subdivision would have minimal impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat, although the Planning Board thought there would be significant impacts. He noted public discussions where John Vore and he said that the impact on wildlife would be large and elk would be pushed out. He said that the Staff Report to the County Commissioners did not mention these items from the Planning Board.

Mary Lee said she felt like their time discussing the subdivision was for naught and it did not make any difference what they said because it was not part of their deliberation. She thought the Board should have a meeting with the Commissioners to see what they expect.

Dale observed that Les said they voted that wildlife was a big priority, but he did not think the Board said that wildlife was significant in their discussions.

Karen said that Staff did provide the Board's discussion in their minutes and the Board's votes in the RCA. She noted that the two review criteria that the majority thought were significant were public health and safety and effects on local services.

Les said the Commissioners were not referring to the Planning Board's report and they did not have comments about what the Board considered.

Lori said the Board needs to communicate with the County Commissioners and they need to have an overall plan.

Karen suggested having Staff, the Planning Board, and the County Commissioners get together and discuss key issues and do some strategic planning.

Dan announced that he and Tom have been on the Board for many years and the Commissioners appear to ignore the Board's deliberations. He said that maybe the

Commissioners did not read the Planning Boards' report, or maybe they did not agree with the Planning Board's opinion, but what they do is important because when the County Commissioners need to know something, they can read what the Board recommends.

Phil said that Karen's proposal gets the Board out of the redundancy business and lets them start looking forward.

George Corn said that he has been talking with Karen about this for 18 months or so. He said the process is not working and it needs to be streamlined. He said he liked the idea of one hearing and having the Commissioners do the hard work on subdivisions because the Board has been sidetracked with it. He said he thinks that the Planning Board should focus on long-term planning and that the County Commissioners have been using the Board as a sounding board, a cover, and/or an excuse. He noted that the regulation changes could include more accountability for elected officials and he also noted that with bigger subdivision applications, there is more of a chance for new information. He commented that additional meetings drain on the County Attorney's and Planning Department's offices.

Mary Lee noted that the County is behind in a few areas because both the Planning Department and the Planning Board spend their time reviewing subdivisions.

Karen commented that she cannot think of another planning board in Montana that acts as a Planning Board instead of a Subdivision and Zoning Review Board.

Dan asked how the Commissioners will react.

George Corn replied he thinks it makes sense, but he does not know how the Commissioners will take it.

Karen noted that in order to change the procedure, the County Commissioners have to adopt the new regulations. She explained that the Commissioners have to seek advice from the Planning Board on subdivisions, but the Planning Board can choose how to respond. She said the Board should set up internal procedures so they can respond to certain subdivisions or create subcommittees.

Les thought Staff should summarize the Planning Board's hearings and give the County Commissioners that summary in a document so they could see the Board's views.

George Corn said that if the new regulations are adopted, the County Commissioners would hold the public hearings and would hear the testimony first-hand. He noted that the Board could offer an independent decision.

Karen said the new regulations would allow the Board to pick and choose subdivision battles because the board would not have to consider some items.

Dan stated that they need to develop a process to review subdivisions.

George said the new process is more logical and the County would have a better product.

Dale commented that he knows the Commissioners are busy, but maybe someone could talk to them regarding what happened at Planning Board meetings.

Les said that the rationale for their actions was not recognized at the recent Aspen Springs meeting.

Karen replied that it is possible that the Commissioners got lost in all the paper for this project. She noted that they were totally prepared for the first meeting, but they may have forgotten some of the information because they had to wait for the second meeting.

Dan also noted that opponents of certain subdivisions can manipulate the system and lengthen the process by introducing new information between meetings.

George said it leads him to think the new regulations are a preferred alternative. He also said the public process does not have to be indefinite so there will not be as many public hearings.

Les said that he agrees with Karen and that Perry Ashby offered additional monetary mitigation that the Board did not consider.

Karen said the applicant has to consult with the governing body about mitigation, but if there is a significant change to a proposal or new information, it has to be considered as new information.

George remarked that the current process encourages that.

Karen said that developers want to go to the governing body to debate mitigation.

14. **New Business**

There was none.

15. **Old Business**

There was none.

16. **Next Regularly Scheduled Meeting:** November 1, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

- (A) Vernon Ranchettes (Scussel) Minor Subdivision – Public Hearing
- (B) One Horse Estates (Martin) Major Subdivision – Public Hearing
- (C) Moiese Meadows (Lords) Major Subdivision – Public Hearing

17. **Adjournment**

Dan adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.